DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 091 CG 020 134

AUTHOR Cobb, Carolyn T.; Stacey, Dennis C.
TITLE Performance Appraisal and Accountability for School Psychologists: Issues and Procedures.
PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists (19th, New Orleans, LA, March 4-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Competence; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Job Performance; *Personnel Evaluation; *School Psychologists; State Standards; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *North Carolina

ABSTRACT

This document concerns performance appraisal as mandated by the North Carolina Legislature for all certified educational professionals. It notes that, in 1985, all newly certified professional education personnel, including school psychologists, came under the Initial Certification Program (ICP) requirements which issued newly certified school psychologists 2-year certificates and evaluted their performance at the end of 2 years to determine whether they possessed the skills of a practicing school psychologist. The need to establish competencies and functions of the school psychologist and to develop an instrument for performance appraisal are addressed. Content issues are discussed in the areas of an empirical basis for competencies, a framework for competencies, building competencies for the future, and identifying uniqueness. Process issues of how psychologists would be evaluated and who would conduct the evaluation are considered. Seven major functions for school psychologists are defined: (1) assessment and interpretation; (2) direct intervention for students; (3) consultation and training; (4) program development; (5) school psychology program implementation; (6) professional practice and development; and (7) communication and relationship skills. Methodological or procedural aspects of performance appraisal for school psychologists are addressed in the areas of formative versus summative aspects of performance appraisal, parameters of actual measurement of the school psychologist's performance, and implications for remaining formative and summative evaluation. The School Psychologist Performance Appraisal Instrument is appended. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285091

Performance Appraisal and Accountability for School Psychologists: Issues and Procedures

Carolyn T. Cobb

Division of Student Services

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Dennis C. Stacey

Division of Personnel Relations

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

CG020134

Presented at the Annual convention of the

National Association of School Psychologists

New Orleans, Louisiana

April, 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carolyn T. Cobb

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Performance Appraisal and Accountability for School Psychologists:

Issues and Procedures

Evaluation or performance appraisal of school psychologists is receiving increased attention in both the professional literature and education circles. although there seems to be agreement on the need for evaluation, the ways in which it can or should be done are less clear. Any evaluation procedure should contain at least three basic components: (a) what is to be evaluated, (b) how it should be evaluated, and (c) who should evaluate it.

Why should we be concerned about performance appraisal (PA)? Emphasis on accountability for psychological services is part of an increased focus on accountability throughout education. Consumers are asking what they are getting for the dollars spent. Emphasis on effective schools, career ladders, and merit pay imply regulatory purposes for PA. In these instances, PA relates to personnel decisions and may determine who enters or remains in the field or how one advances. This is a summative evaluation view of PA. From a professional perspective, PA can serve a formative function in helping to enhance the development and effectiveness of the school psychologist (and ultimately outcomes for students). It is this latter perspective that should guide our thinking about PA, while not forgetting the summative uses.

Teachers increasingly are being evaluated on the basis of teaching behaviors which have been empirically associated with higher student achievement. If teachers are being evaluated on the basis of behaviors which lead to better outcomes for students, how will school psychologists

be evaluated? It is no longer acceptable to avoid evaluating the outcomes of psychological services because of the frequently indirect nature of services or the difficulty in measuring intended outcomes. Yet the school psychology literature does not offer much direction on the empirical bases of our practices.

Performance Appraisal in North Carolina

Performance appraisal was mandated by the North Carolina Legislature several years ago for all certified educational professionals. Job descriptions and PA instruments were developed for each certification area, including school psychology. The implicit first priority of this PA mandate was summative evaluation, or accountability purposes. However, the State Department of Public Instruction (SDPI) also tried to emphasize a healthier (they perceived) formative approach, focusing on a process of mutual goal setting and professional growth and development (Division of Personnel Relations, 1981). The dual emphasis on formative and summative purposes of PA has continued to be emphasized, at least on paper, but ensuring balanced implementation is sometimes another matter.

In addition to PA, legislation was passed three years ago that changed the manner in which the State issues certificates to all school personnel. This initiative was called the "Initial Certification Program" (ICP). Under these new regulations, a newly certified person receives an "initial" certificate for a two-year period. At the end of this two-year period, the individual is evaluated against and must be "at standard" on functions and competencies deemed to be essential for that professional specialty before a permanent of continuing certificate

will be issued. If the individual is not deemed to be at standard on these essential competencies, s/he will not receive a continuing certificate and, consequently, will not be able to practice in the schools. A mentoring and/or support team process is called for both in the legislation and regulations in order to facilitate the professional growth of the initially certified professional and to help remediate any weaknesses found during this two-year period. Thus, the intent is to provide the support necessary to become competent if at all possible.

A look at the evolution of the ICP for teachers will help provide a context for the school psychology efforts later. The new ICP requirements were applied first to teachers. In the interests of having an empirical basis for evaluating teachers, the SDPI contracted with the Group for the Study of Effective Teaching at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to develop research-based competencies. The evaluation instrument developed grew out of an exhaustive review and synthesis of the effective teaching research literature (White, Wyne, Stuck, & Coop, 1983). Essentially, five basic teaching functions were identified as applicable to all teachers, regardless of certification area or career status. In 1984-85 a task force revised the existing teacher PA instrument, which applied to all teachers and not just the newly certified teachers. The teacher task force realized that the empirically determined, essential competencies on the ICP instrument were also the ones that should apply to all teachers. Three additional competencies were added that went beyond the actual practices of teaching but which were thought to be related to effective teaching and work in the schools.

Effective January 1, 1985 all newly certified professional education personnel - including school psychologists - came under the ICP requirements. Thus, as of that date, newly certified school psychologists were issued two-year certificates, to be evaluated two years hence to determine if they met the essential skills of a practicing school psychologist. The State found itself in the position of requiring a program without funds to support the process and without identified initial competencies for any area other than teachers. Therefore, although the initial certificate period and evaluation was mandatory, local school systems were not required to use any specified competencies or to provide any mentoring or support process for the initially certified psychologist. School systems were encouraged to use the existing PA instrument for psychologists as an interim step until competencies defining the essential nature of the school psychologist's job could be developed. The existing instrument was not deemed adequate by the School Psychology Section of SDPI due to changes that had been made in its development by the SDPI Research Division. However, it was a temporary solution.

In December, 1985 a Student Services Task Force composed of trainer and practitioner representatives in each of the areas of school counseling, school psychology, and school social work met to develop initial competencies in these three specialty areas. As this work was begun, a number of questions and issues confronted the task force, some of which continue to beg for resolution.

As happened with the development of the teacher competencies, the school psychology task force concluded that most of the evolving initial competencies were equally applicable to all school psychologists. Thus, the functions and competencies also served to revise the regular PA instrument and will be the basis for evaluating the initially certified, as well as the experienced, school psychologist.

The remainder of the paper focuses on the development of the PA instrument and the evaluation process, including: (a) content and process issues that guided essential decisions, (b) an overview of the functions and competencies developed, and (c) emerging ideas on the PA process (i.e., how competencies can be evaluated and who might be able to evaluate them).

Content Issues and Questions

Several content issues emerged and had to be resolved before development of the competencies could begin.

An empirical basis for competencies. The most justifiable competencies that could be identified would be those that had been validated empirically in some way. Reviews of the literature, especially in the areas of counseling and consultation, yielded little useful information. Conversations with "experts" in various content areas also resulted in little information about empirical bases for selection of competencies. Some direction is offered by the area of behavioral consultation, for example, but these variables or practice indicators are too discrete to be used for an effective overall evaluation instrument. Thus, other bases for selecting functions and competencies had to be pursued.

A framework for competencies. The lack of success on the empirical bases led the school psychology task force to look for another kind of framework on which to build school psychology competencies. The emphasis on effective schooling and teaching and the emerging implications for school psychology led to the decision to use the framework of "effective schools" as the rationale for competency development. After further deliberation, the term "effective learning" was substituted for the overriding conceptual framework, allowing for the school psychologist's relationship to schools, classrooms, and individual students.

Efforts were made to incorporate the scientist/practitioner model and a problem-solving approach. The possibility of radically reorienting the domains of practice from the more traditional "assessment, intervention, and consultation" was considered. However, the task force decided rather to try to build new emphases into the more familiar structure.

Building competencies for the future. While charged with identifying competencies that could be applied to PA in the immediate future, the subcommittee also wanted to construct an instrument that could grow with future directions in school psychology. Of course, that meant future directions had to be identified. Documents such as School Psychology: Blueprint for Training and Practice(National School Psychology Inservice, 1984) were reviewed. In looking at the increasing emphasis on instructional effectiveness, teaching and classroom effectiveness, and the social/personal issues facing students, the subcommittee attempted to incorporate functions and competencies that would emphasize the

application of psychology to the schooling process, or an applied psychology approach. This orientation meant increasing emphasis on instructional and environmental assessment (in addition to the more traditional assessment functions) and applied interventions, such as social skills and cognitive training and instruction (in addition to more traditional counseling and behavior modification skills). The real challenge was to construct a PA instrument so that new directions could be encouraged without putting employed and traditionally trained school psychologists immediately at risk in the evaluation process.

Identifying our uniqueness. The overall Student Services Task Force had been encouraged by others in the SDPI to try to identify common functions across each of our professional specialties, even though specific competencies might differ. Although each area seemed to be cautious about this approach, the school psychology task force was the most resistant to this direction, based on a belief in our uniqueness and, frankly, political considerations. Common functions across the three specialties, such as "assessment, counseling, consultation, program development" could conceivably be identified. However, some push had been made previously in the State to merge these specialties into one generic "student services specialist". School psychologists had opposed that move successfully, and the subcommittee was concerned that explicit coordination of evaluation functions would only renew that effort and blur professional distinctiveness.

In examing what unique contributions school psychologists make to the schooling process, the subcommittee returned to psychology's relationship to the instructional aspect of schooling. Social workers and counselors also deal with social/personal problems in various ways, but they have little to do with direct intervention in the student's instructional process per se. For example, the five teaching functions on the teacher appraisal instrument are clearly areas in which school psychologists should have some knowledge and expertise.

These issues helped to direct the content of the functions and competencies ultimately proposed. They reflect the WHAT of evaluation and will be the basis for evaluating both initially and permanently certified psychologists.

Process Issues and Questions

In addition to the actual competencies for PA, the subcommittee struggled with two basic process issues: (a) How will psychologists be evaluated and (b) Who can appropriately evaluate them? Teachers are evaluated primarily through observations of their practice in classroom settings, according to the competencies specified. School psychologists practice in a variety of settings, so that it is difficult to quickly observe them. Many of the competencies and functions may not be completed on one observation session (e.g., consultation processes) and, thus, would not be adequately evaluated in this manner. Finally, the question of how appropriate it would be to have a third party observe some functions was raised (e.g., counseling sessions with students, standardized testing). The subcommittee felt that it would be necessary

to provide recommendations and examples of multiple ways that data and information could be obtained to determine if competencies were being met.

Since many LEAs employ only one or two psychologists and since many psychologists are supervised by nonpsychologists, the issue of who can and should evaluate school psychologists is a difficult one to address practically. Although the subcommittee realized that, in reality, there would be instances in which there would be no psychologist in the PA process, they have issued a strong position that another school psychologist must be involved in the PA process, at least for some of the professional and technical competencies. The North Carolina School Psychology Association has reinforced this position in their recommendations to the State Department on career development programs and on evaluation. Possible ways to address those instances where no psychologists are available include better inclusion of university faculty in the LEA PA process and possible regional supervision groups in rural parts of the State. These options will need considerable further discussion with the SDPI.

Performance Appraisal Instrument for School Psychologists

The functions and competencies developed for school psychologists, as well as the rating scale to be used, are included in the Appendix. There are seven Major Functions: (a) assessment and interpretation, (b) direct interventions for students, (c) consultation and training, (d) program development, (e) school psychology program implementation,

(f) professional practice and development, and (g) communication and relationship skills. Although competencies specified for each function area must be considered, only major functions are actually rated on a six-point scale. A rating of "not applicable" is possible if a particular function area does not apply to the evaluated psychologist's role in the current job. All competencies apply to both initially certified school psychologists and the experienced psychologists, except for 3.7 (providing in-service programs) and 6.4 (engages in continuing professional development). Although initially certified psychologists may participate in these activities, they are considered to be more relevant to the continuing certification psychologist.

Parameters of Performance Appraisal for School Psychologists

This section focuses on methodological or procedural aspects of PA for school psychologists. These guidelines are in draft form and will continue to be revised and expanded during 1987-88. Three areas are addressed: (a) formative versus summative aspects of PA, (b) parameters of actual measurement of the school psychologist's (SP's) performance, and (c) implications for remaining formative and summative evaluation.

Formative evaluation. The context advocated for conducting PA is one which features formative as opposed to summative evaluation. The purpose of formative evaluation is the guided growth and development of the evaluatee. Thus, the proposed approach to PA for school psychologists will be based in the context of primarily formative evaluations. Although there will be critical summative uses of PA, the process itself should still be based on formative approaches.

Parameters of Performance appraisal. Parameters of measuring job performance include the type of data which can be used to measure the various competencies, options relative to acquiring and processing of PA data, and the requirements of the type of evaluator who is appropriate to appraise each type of prescribed data. For the sake of simplicity and illustration, this discussion will be limited to the most basic job description for SP's - the primary functions of initial certification competencies, as depicted in Table 1.

The generic types of data which can be used to measure SP competencies consist of measured SP service outcomes, other's opinions of SP services, work products, and the SP's documentation of his/her own delivery of services. Outcomes of services and third-party opinions appear to offer more powerful measures of SP performance, and thus are featured in this Table, despite the tendency of SP's to favor the last data source - i.e., enumeration of services rendered - in documenting performance (Zins & Fairchild, 1986).

Who can evaluate PA information for school psychologists must also be considered. To address this issue, the generic evaluation process must be considered in terms of the more finite steps of (a) who can provide measures of or data on performance, (b) who should collect or acquire the data, and (c) who can verify and analyze it. In addition, to the extent that PA is viewed in formative (i.e., helping) evaluation terms, there is the matter of (a) who conferences with the SP relative to the PA data collected, (b) who monitors and coaches the SP in the context of any professional development plan which emerges from the evaluative conferences, and (c) who conducts the summative evaluation of the school psychologist.

Implications for Comprehensive PA. Having raised this scope of responsibilities for conducting comprehensive performance appraisal of the SP, the latter half of Table 1 proposes the parties to the PA process who might actually carry out each of the specific PA responsibilities. A summary of these proposed responsibilities follows:

1. Provision of PA Data
    a. In the case of outcome-oriented data or products of a particular SP service, the evaluated SP could usually provide or make available the PA data.
    b. In the case of using others' opinions of the SP's performance, those who are the primary recipients of SP services or collaborators with the SP in the delivery of services would be the most appropriate sources of opinions of performance.
2. Acquisition of PA Data
    a. In the case of outcome-oriented or product-oriented data made available by the evaluated SP, a specifically appointed evaluating SP (or team of SP's) would be the most appropriate party to collect such data.
    b. In the case of opinion-oriented PA data, the evaluating SP, or the SP's supervisor, if different from the evaluating SP, would be the most appropriate party to collect such data.
3. Verification and Analysis of PA Data
    a. The evaluating SP would seem to be the only appropriate person to analyze PA data relative to the major job

functions of assessment, intervention, and consultation - three areas of SP training and functioning which require a perspective unique to the SP profession.

b. Relative to other major functions, other parties could share in the analysis of PA data as follows:

i) SP interventions of an affective or behavioral focus could be analyzed by appropriate supervisors or specialists in Student (Support) Services.

ii) Analysis of the PA data of the job functions of Consultation, Establishing s Psychological Services Program, Professional Practice, and Communication could be appropriately analyzed, at least in part, by the SP's immediate supervisor (who may not be the evaluating SP). The only exception to this proposal would hold for the "Professional Practice" competency having to do with conformity to prevailing professional standards, which appropriately should be analyzed by an evaluating SP.

4. With one minor exception, the post-measurement or observation conference (i.e., formative evaluation conference) with the evaluated SP could also be handled, depending on the particular job function, by the same parties proposed in number 3 for the analysis of PA data on the SP. The exception might be the job function of consultation, in which one or more school principals served by and the immediate supervisor of the SP could join the evaluating SP in conferencing with the SP.

5. Monitoring and Coaching

The monitoring and coaching of the post-conference professional development of the SP also would be jointly shared by an overseeing SP and the SP's supervisor, in most cases. The term "overseeing" is used to allow for the possibility that the SP who monitors and coaches the evaluated SP's professional development may not be the same one(s) who took part in earlier evaluation procedures. Development of SP competencies best overseen by a SP mentor alone would be those comprising (a) the assessment and consultation functions, (b) the conformity with professional standards aspect of professional practice, and (c) the communication skills. Development of SP competencies which could be overseen by the supervisor regardless of this person's background, would hold for the competencies of (a) professional development, and (b) the logistical aspects of communication having to do with availability and accessibility. Finally, the supervisor and evaluating SP could jointly oversee the SP's professional development in the areas of (a) some intervention functions, (b) the coordination competency of the consultation function, and (c) the psychological services program function.

6. Summative Evaluation

Summative evaluation of the SP in considered from two aspects. First, it is proposed that an evaluation team which conducts this evaluation of the SP should minimally consist of the evaluating SP and the SP's supervisor - if the person is not a SP. Second,

it is proposed that final authority for summative evaluation should be that of the evaluating SP in the case of the first three function areas, and the SP's supervisor (if not the evaluating SP) in the case of the last three function areas.

Throughout the above summary of who might participate in the comprehensive evaluation process of the SP, reference is made to an evaluating SP as well as the evaluated SP's supervisor, who may or may not be a SP. Thus, depending on a particular SP's supervisory situation, the proposed evaluation roles could be carried out through various arrangements. The simplest options would be either one where the SP's supervisor is also the evaluating SP or one where the supervisor in a non-SP. In the latter situation, both the supervisor and evaluating SP would participate in the evaluation process. In the former situation, it is conceivable - though perhaps not advisable - that the supervising SP could represent both the SP and supervisor roles proposed. "Inadvisable" is used for several reasons. For one, it seems unlikely that any single, even experienced SP could have sufficient expertise in all job functions on which the SP would be evaluated to do justice to such an evaluation. Second, there is the matter of mastering or integrating the multiplicity of roles that would be required of this single evaluator - data procurer and analyst, evaluator, and coach and mentor. Finally, the challenge of objectivity could be raised about the decisions of even the rare SP who manages to embody all of the evaluator prerequisites raised above. In short, it seems highly unlikely if not advisable for more than one evaluator to be involved in the overall process of objectively evaluating the SP, which encompasses

four evaluation responsibilities (i.e., data analysis, conferencing, monitoring and coaching, and summative evaluation) covering seven target job functions.

In the cases where more than one party is proposed for analyzing or conferencing on PA data (such as would be the case when the SP's supervisor is not a SP), decisions will need to be made as to: (a) whether the non-SP is or feels competent to be part of the evaluation process, (b) how it will be decided whether more than one evaluator is necessary to carry out a particular evaluation task, (c) how more than one evaluator will cooperate and coordinate their efforts, and (d) who on the evaluation team will have final authority for decisions which are made relative to analyzing PA data, conferencing with the SP, monitoring and supporting the professional development of the SP, and summatively evaluating the SP.

Since it is proposed that one or more SP's be involved in the PA of the SP, the availability of evaluating SP's may be an issue for some school systems. Even further limiting the availability of evaluating SP's is the comprehensive expertise which would be required of them. Thus, strategies to deal with this availability issue would have to be devised. These strategies would seemingly have to incorporate maximizing the pool of evaluator candidates, as well as developing a system for making identified evaluators available to school systems in need. The former strategy could begin to be addressed by recruiting evaluator cadidates from both university faculties and practicing SPs. The latter strategy could begin to be addressed by developing networks or systems in which evaluating SPs are exchanged among school systems, or made available on a regional basis to insure that even the most outlying of systems are accommodated.

References

Division of Personnel Relations, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (1981). Handbook for performance appraisal: General supervisor and school psychologist. Raleigh, NC: Author.

White, K. P., Wyne, M. D., Stuck, G. B., & Coop, R. H. (1983). Teaching effectiveness evaluation project. Chapel Hill, NC: Group for the Study of Effective Teaching, University of North Carolina.

Zins, J. & Fairchild, T. (1986). An investigation of the accountability practices of school psychologists. Professional School Psychology, 1, 193-204.

Appendix

School Psychologist

Performance Appraisal Instrument

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

Guidelines

1. The supervisor/evaluator(s) and the school psychologist mutually define the job functions and competencies to be evaluated at the beginning of each year. The function and/or competencies may be modified to meet the specified role of an individual school psychologist in the local education agency, but all modifications must be noted and signed by the psychologist and the supervisor.

2. A plan for evaluation, feedback, and indicated revision of performance standards is developed. Designated times for formative feedback during the year should be included.

3. Multiple sources of information and data used to evaluate competencies and functions are considered, especially for areas where observations may intrude on the service being delivered (e.g., counseling and assessment).

4. Attempts are made to have a trained psychologist evaluate the employed school psychologist on technical and professional aspects of practice (e.g., assessment, psychological interventions, consultation). Such peer evaluation is especially important during years when the school psychologist is being considered for advancement on the career ladder.

5. Once the evaluation is completed as specified on the performance appraisal instrument, the supervisor and school psychologist develop professional development plans. Professional development plans should not be limited to areas of deficiency but should be developed for areas "at standard" or higher in which the school psychologist may have special interests or desire continued growth.

JOB DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

REPORTS TO: Superintendent, Level II or Level III School Psychologists, Director, or Associate or Assistant Superintendent.

SUPERVISES: May supervise professional, paraprofessional and clerical staff.

PURPOSES: To facilitate learning and to promote the cognitive, social and personal development of all students.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. MAJOR FUNCTION: ASSESSMENT AND INTERPRETATION

Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Uses assessment data about the student and his/her environment(s) in developing appropriate interventions and programs.

2. MAJOR FUNCTION: DIRECT INTERVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS

Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment.

3. MAJOR FUNCTION: CONSULTATION AND TRAINING

Provides consultation to parents, teachers, other school personnel, and community agencies to enhance the learning and adjustment of students.

4. MAJOR FUNCTION: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs.

5. MAJOR FUNCTION: SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.

6. MAJOR FUNCTION: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND DEVELOPMENT

Applies ethics and standards of professional practice in the delivery of school psychological services and observes relevant laws and policies that govern practice. Participates in professional organizations and continually seeks to improve professional knowledge and skill.

7. MAJOR FUNCTION: COMMUNICATION AND RELATIONSHIP SKILLS

Communicates effectively with students, parents, and school staff.

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. The evaluator is to rate the school psychologist on six-point scale as indicated below.
2. The competencies pertinent to each major function must be selected and discussed by the supervisor and psychologist at the beginning of the year.
3. The evaluator is encouraged to add pertinent comments at the end of each major function.
4. The school psychologist is provided an opportunity to react to the evaluator's ratings and comments.
5. The evaluator and the school psychologist must discuss the results of the appraisal and any recommended action pertinent to it.
6. The school psychologist and the evaluator must sign the instrument in the assigned spaces.
7. The instrument must be filed in the school psychologist's personnel folder.

School Psychologist Name:

_____

School or Base-assignment:

_____

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

1.0 MAJOR FUNCTION: ASSESSMENT AND INTERPRETATION

1.1 Assists in early identification of students' learning and adjustment problems.

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

1.2 Conducts assessments appropriate to the focus of concern and according to prevailing professional standards.

1.3 Conducts assessments with consideration of the characteristics of the student or group of students (including ethnic, cultural, socio-economic, and handicapping considerations).

1.4 Assists in identifying factors in the learning environment that may affect the student and assessing their degree of impact.

1.5 Integrates data from assessment procedures and develops hypotheses relative to (1) instructional and educational programming and (2) program eligibility and placement.

1.6 Assists in planning and developing interventions, programs and/or services based on the identified needs of the student or group of students.

Comments _____

_____

2.0 MAJOR FUNCTION: DIRECT INTERVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS

2.1 Teaches students how to develop effective learning strategies and personal and social skills.

2.2 Counsels students on educational and personal adjustment issues.

2.3 Evaluates effectiveness of individual and group interventions and modifies interventions based on data collected.

Comments _____

_____

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

3.0 MAJOR FUNCTION: CONSULTATION AND TRAINING

3.1 Demonstrates knowledge of consultation models and processes.

3.2 Consults with teachers, other school staff, and parents about ways to facilitate learning and adjustment for individuals or groups of students.

3.3 Consults with teachers and other school staff on classroom, school, or system needs.

3.4 Helps provide liaison and coordination between the school system and other relevant agencies to facilitate services for students and families.

3.5 Interprets educational policies, programs, and procedures related to psychological services.

3.6 Provides information, and/or education in the application of learning theory, child development, and other psychological principles to school personnel and parents.

3.7 Plans and implements in-service programs for staff and/or parents.

Comments _____

_____

4.0 MAJOR FUNCTION: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Conducts and/or assists in conducting formal and informal needs assessment to determine program characteristics and needs.

4.2 Works with others to develop programs and program strategies to maximize learning for students.

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

4.3 Assists in planning for the evaluation of programs.

4.4 Assists school personnel in analyzing, interpreting, and disseminating results of program evaluations.

Comments _____

_____

5.0 MAJOR FUNCTION: SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Assists in the development of a comprehensive program of services to all students.

5.2 Adheres to established program goals, priorities, and objectives.

5.3 Plans, maintains, and/or participates in a system of accountability for services delivered.

6.0 MAJOR FUNCTION: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND DEVELOPMENT

6.1 Delivers services consistent with the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the American Psychological Association (APA) ethical principles and professional standards of practice.

6.2 Observes federal, state, and local policies and regulations in the delivery of school psychological services.

6.3 Works to ensure students' rights and welfare in the school and community.

6.4 Engages in continuing professional development by assessing one's own needs and seeking ways to address needs.

Comments _____

_____

Rating Scale
(Please Check)

	Superior	Well Above Standard	Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory
7.0 MAJOR FUNCTION: COMMUNICATION AND RELATIONSHIP SKILLS						

7.1 Effectively communicates knowledge and ideas orally to individuals and groups.

7.2 Effectively communicates knowledge and ideas in writing.

7.3 Maintains effective interpersonal relationships and communication in the professional setting.

Comments _____

_____

Evaluator's Summary Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

School Psychologist's Reactions to Evaluation _____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Evaluator's signature and date School Psychologist's signature and date

Signature indicates that the written evaluation has been seen and discussed.

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

INSTRUCTIONS:
1. Based on the evidence from observation, discussion, and other forms of data collection, the evaluator is to rate the school psychologists performance with respect to the seven major functions listed below.
2. The evaluator is encouraged to add pertinent comments at the end of each major function.
3. The psychologist is provided an opportunity to react to the evaluator's ratings and comments.
4. The evaluator and the psychologist must discuss the results of the appraisal and any recommended action pertinent to it.
5. The psychologist and the evaluator must sign the instrument in the assigned spaces.
6. The instrument must be filed in the psychologist's personnel folder.
7. The rating scale will be as follows:

Level of Performance

6. Superior
Performance within this function area is consistently outstanding. Practices are demonstrated at the highest level of performance. Psychologist continuously seeks to expand scope of competencies and constantly undertakes additional, appropriate responsibilities.

5. Well Above Standard
Performance within this function area is frequently outstanding. Some practices are demonstrated at the highest level while others are at a consistently high level. School psychologist frequently seeks to expand scope of competencies and often undertakes additional, appropriate responsibilities.

4. Above Standard
Performance within this function area is frequently high. Some practices are demonstrated at a high level while others are at a consistently adequate/acceptable level. School psychologist sometimes seeks to expand scope of competencies and occasionally undertakes additional, appropriate responsibilities.

3. At Standard
Performance within this function area is consistently adequate/acceptable. Practices fully meet all performance expectations at an acceptable level. Psychologist maintains an adequate scope of competencies and performs additional responsibilities as assigned.

2. Below Standard
Performance within this function area is sometimes inadequate/unacceptable and needs improvement. Psychologist requires supervision and assistance to maintain an adequate scope of competencies, and sometimes fails to perform additional responsibilities as assigned.

1. Unsatisfactory
Performance within this function area is consistently inadequate/unacceptable and most practices require considerable improvement to fully meet minimum performance expectations. Psychologist requires close and frequent supervision in the performance of all responsibilities.

Table 1

Performance Appraisal Process for School Psychologists

SP1= SP Evaluatee
SP2= Evaluator SP
Su= SP's Supervisor
Cs= Consumers, collaborators re: SP services
SS= Student Services Administrator

MAJOR FUNCTION AREA	COMPETENCY	PRACTICES	MEASUREMENT/DATA OPTIONS	DATE PROCESSING: PROVIDE	ACQUIRE	ANALYZE	CONFER	MONITOR & COACH	SUMMATIVE EVAL. TEAM	SUMMATIVE EVAL. FINAL
ASSESSMENT: Cognitive, Interpersonal, Behavioral & Environmental	Standardized individual and group assessment	°Clarifies students' needs	[a]Paper case review [b]Observe conference	[a]SP1	[b]SP2	SP2	SP2	SP2		
		°Determines eval. components	" " "	"		"	"	"		
		°Uses appropriate instruments	" " "	"		"	"	"		
		°Properly conducts evaluation	[a]Obs. admin. [b]Review scoring, interpr.	"	"	"	"	"		
	Hypothesis formation	°Offers recommendations & Rx's	Paper case review	"		"	"	"	Su,SP2	SP2
INTERVENTION: Academic, Interpersonal, & Behavioral	Individual/Grp: Counseling, Education and Skills training	°Determines needs and goals	[a]Paper case review [b]Review session tape	[a]SP1		[b]SP2,SS	SP2,SS	SP2, SS	" "	
		°Determines appro. strategies	" " " [b] " " "			" "	" "	" "	" "	
		°Implements " "	[a]Survey clients [b] " " "	[a]Cs [b]SP1	"	" "	" "	" "	" "	
		°Evaluates " "	" " " " "	" "	"	" "	" "	" "	" "	"
CONSULTATION: Academic, Interspersonal, & Behavioral	Case & program consultation	°Selects appro. model, process	[a]Paper case review [b]Observe session	[a]SP1	[b]SP2	"	",Su	"	" "	
		°Conducts consultation	[a]Survey consultees [b]Review session tape	[a]Cs [b]SP1	"	"	" "	"	" "	
		°Evaluates "		SP1	"	"	"	"	" "	
	Liaison with agencies	°Coordinates services	[a]Paper case review [b]Survey clients	[a]SP1 [b]Cs	[a]SP2 [b]Su	" ,Su	" "	", Su	" "	
		°Educates & interprets	" "	"	"	" "	" "	" "	" "	"
PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES PROGRAM	Designs program	°Devises plan & time frame	" " "	SP1	SP2	" "	" "	" "	" "	
	Implements "	°Adheres to plan	[a]Records review [b]Survey Cs	[a]SP1 [b]Cs	Su	" "	" "	" "	" "	
		°Keeps others informed	" "	"	"	" "	" "	" "	" "	
		°Manages resources	" " " "	[a]SP1 [b]Cs	"	" "	" "	" "	" "	
	Evaluates "	°Maintains records	" "	SP1		" "	" "	" "	" "	Su
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE	Abides by professional stds. & ethics, & regs.	°Access to stds. & reg's.	[a]Observe resources [b]Survey Cs	[a]SP1 [b]Cs	[a]SP2 [b]Su	SP2	" "	"	"	
	Professional development	°Id. needs & alternatives	[a]Review PDP [b]Survey Su	[a]SP1	[b]SP2	SP2,Su	" "		" "	
		°Keeps credentials current	Review credentials & PDP outcomes	Su,SP1		" "	" "		" "	"
COMMUNICATION	Is understood	°Organizes thoughts	[a]Review of written products, Observe presentations [b]Survey Cs	[a]SP1 [b]Cs	SP2	" "	" "	"	"	
		°Solicits feedback	" " " "	" "	SP2,Su	" "	" "	"	" "	
	Understands others	°Listens	" " " "	" "	" "	" "	" "	"	" "	
	Available and accessible	°Keeps others informed	[a]Review records [b]Survey Cs	[a]SP1 [b]Cs	"	"	"	"	" "	
		°Responsive and reliable	" "	"	"	"	"	"	" "	"